

**08/21/18 BD MEETING – ITEM #4
CHANGE SHEET #2 (CIRCULATED 08/20/18)
Final Substitute Environmental Document
in Support of Potential Changes to the Water Quality Control Plan for the
San Francisco Bay-Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary:
San Joaquin River Flows and Southern Delta Water Quality**

This change sheet contains minor revisions to address typographical or clerical errors in the final substitute environmental document (Final SED) that were found after the Final SED was released to the public on July 6, 2018. The revisions are generally organized according to their order of appearance in the SED. The revisions are generally identified by page number and section number, as well as table or figure number, as applicable.

Vol- ume	Chapter/ Appendix/ Master Response	Page	Section	Table/Figure	Revision	Rationale for Change
1	<i>Executive Summary</i>	ES-32	<i>Agricultural Effects</i>	--	Overall, as the percent of unimpaired flow increases, the negative effect on total jobs increases. LSJR Alternative 3 (40 percent unimpaired flow) results in a 2 percent mean annual decrease in employment, which is a loss of 424-458 jobs from baseline employment of 18,232-19,227 jobs.	Typographical error. The numbers were updated in Table ES-10 but were not updated in the sentence referencing the numbers. The numbers in the sentence are struck and updated to reflect the correct numbers in Table ES-10.
1	Chapter 5, <i>Surface Hydrology</i>	5-26	5.2.5, <i>Stanislaus River</i>	--	South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID), Oakdale Irrigation District (OID), Stockton East Water District (SEWD), and	Text edit. The text was edited to more accurately describe the

Vol- ume	Chapter/ Appendix/ Master Response	Page	Section	Table/Figure	Revision	Rationale for Change
	<i>and Water Quality</i>				<p>Central San Joaquin Water Conservation District (CSJWCD) divert water from the Stanislaus River at Goodwin Dam. <u>As described in Chapter 2, Section 2.5.2, Under the 1988 Agreement, senior water rights holders SSJID and OID jointly have an agreement with USBR (the 1988 Agreement) hold rights with USBR to divert up to 600 TAF from the Stanislaus River from New Melones Reservoir when the projected annual inflow to New Melones is greater than 600 TAF. OID and SSJID have an agreement to equally divide the available water, each receiving up to 300 TAF. USBR contracted with SEWD and CSJWCD for maximum delivery of 155 TAF/y. Riparian diversions are approximately 20 TAF/y (Table F.1.2-2). The maximum diversion from the Stanislaus River is therefore 7755 TAF/y. This represents approximately 67 percent of To put this number into context, the average unimpaired Stanislaus River runoff of 1,120 TAF/y. However, diversions may be limited by availability. For example, if annual inflow to New Melones is projected to be less than 600 TAF, the OID and SSJID diversions are governed by, among other bases of right, the 1988 Agreement, which limits limits OID and SSJID diversions to the inflow plus one-third of the inflow deficit (600 TAF minus the inflow in TAF) (OID 2012)</u></p>	relationship between the parties on the Stanislaus River.

Vol- ume	Chapter/ Appendix/ Master Response	Page	Section	Table/Figure	Revision	Rationale for Change
1	Chapter 7, <i>Aquatic Biological Resources</i>	7-156	7.6, <i>References Cited</i>	--	———. 2017. Learning from carcasses and final fish counts. The Fish Report. Monday, January 23, 2017. Available: http://fishbio.com/field-notes/the-fish-report/learning-carcasses-final-fish-counts. Accessed: August 23, 2017.	Typographical error. This reference was erroneously included in Chapter 7. It is not cited in the chapter.
1	Chapter 7, <i>Aquatic Biological Resources</i>	7-150	7.4.4, <i>Impacts and Mitigation Measures: Extended Plan Area</i>	--	This could result in reduced habitat for aquatic species. In addition, during drought conditions, particularly under LSJR Alternative 3 and LSJR Alternative 4 with or without adaptive implementation, substantial reservoir volume reductions could occur.	Typographical error. Added space between “particularly” and “under.”
1	Chapter 9, <i>Groundwater Resources</i>	9-70	9.6, <i>References Cited</i>	--	———. 2003b. California’s Groundwater Bulletin 118, Update 2003. San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region, San Joaquin Valley Groundwater Basin, Eastern San Joaquin Subbasin. Last revised: 2006. Sacramento, CA.	Typographical error. This reference was erroneously underlined as a new addition to the Final SED. It was in the 2016 Recirculated SED and is not a new source.
1	Chapter 9, <i>Groundwater Resources</i>	9-70	9.6, <i>References Cited</i>	--	———. 2003c. California’s Groundwater Bulletin 118, Update 2003. San Joaquin River Hydrologic Region, San Joaquin Valley Groundwater Basin, Modesto Subbasin. Last revised: 2006. Sacramento, CA.	Typographical error. This reference was erroneously underlined as a new addition to the Final SED. It was in the 2016 Recirculated SED and is not a new source.
1	Chapter 16, <i>Evaluation of Other Indirect and</i>	16-64, 16-234, 16-257,	--	Tables 16-10, 16-25, and 16-28, in Noise impacts discussion.	If sensitive receptors were adjacent to construction activities and experienced construction noise, construction the impacts would be temporary. The noise-	Grammatical error. Revised sentence as indicated by strikeout and underline text so

Vol- ume	Chapter/ Appendix/ Master Response	Page	Section	Table/Figure	Revision	Rationale for Change
	<i>Additional Actions</i>	respec- tively			generating activities would be required to follow existing local noise ordinances limiting the timing of construction (e.g., generally Mondays– Fridays, 7am–6pm).	that it makes sense grammatically
1	Chapter 16, <i>Evaluation of Other Indirect and Additional Actions</i>	--	--	Table 16-30, in Noise impacts section	If sensitive receptors were adjacent to construction activities and experienced construction noise, the impacts would be a-temporary. increase in ambient noise levels due to construction, and t-The noise generating activities would be required to follow existing local noise ordinances limiting the timing of construction (e.g., generally Mondays–Fridays, 7am–6pm).	Grammatical error. Revised sentence as indicated by strikeout and underline text so that it makes sense grammatically.
1	Chapter 16, <i>Evaluation of Other Indirect and Additional Actions</i>	16-14	16.2.1, <i>Transfer/Sale of Surface Water</i>	--	“Groundwater” header should not be italicized.	Typographic error. Removed italics.
1	Chapter 16, <i>Evaluation of Other Indirect and Additional Actions</i>	16-154	16.3.5, <i>Improve Temperature Conditions</i>	Table 16-18, in Hydrology and Water Quality section	However, it is likely that impacts could be mitigated to less than significant once implemented because hazardous materials contamination could be remediated and removed and because the measures would ensure the appropriate handling of hazardous materials during construction.	Typographic error. The phrase that is struck out is a drafting error and is not relevant to the discussion.
1	Chapter 16, <i>Evaluation of Other Indirect and</i>	16-356	16.7, <i>Cumulative Impacts, Aesthetics section</i>	--	New facilities or structures could affect the visual character and quality of the surrounding area depending on the presence or absence of other permanent	Grammatical error. Added “and.”

Vol- ume	Chapter/ Appendix/ Master Response	Page	Section	Table/Figure	Revision	Rationale for Change
	<i>Additional Actions</i>				structures, and the type (e.g., size, bulk) of the permanent structures.	
1	Chapter 16, <i>Evaluation of Other Indirect and Additional Actions</i>	16-99	16.3.1, <i>Floodplain and Riparian Habitat Restoration</i>	Table 16-12, in Air Quality section	Since construction of groundwater wells does not require lengthy construction activities, the potential for significant environmental effects is minimal.	Typographic error. Entire sentence struck as it was relates to groundwater well construction and was erroneously added to a discussion of floodplain and riparian habitat restoration section of this chapter.
1	Chapter 17, <i>Cumulative Impacts, Growth- Inducing Effects, and Irreversible Commitmen t of Resources</i>	17-68	17.2.3, <i>Cumulative Impact Summary</i>	Table 17-4	[Gray highlighting should be removed from <i>Service Providers</i> row as there is no difference between this table and Table 17-3 with respect to the cumulative impact determinations for service providers.]	Typographic error. Removed gray highlighting.
1	Chapter 17, <i>Cumulative Impacts, Growth- Inducing Effects, and Irreversible Commitmen</i>	17-45	17.2.2, <i>Cumulative Impact Analysis, Recreation and Aesthetics section</i>	--	The incremental contribution would be cumulatively ly considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of the projects discussed above, especially considering the sensitivity of the area.	Grammatical error. Added “ly.”

Vol- ume	Chapter/ Appendix/ Master Response	Page	Section	Table/Figure	Revision	Rationale for Change
	<i>t of Resources</i>					
1	Chapter 18, <i>Summary of Impacts and Comparison of Alternatives</i>	18-16	18.2.2, <i>Significant and Unavoidable Impacts, Recreational Resources and Aesthetics section</i>	--	The No Project Alternative (LSJR Alternative 1 and SDWQ Alternative 1)	Typographical error. “1” added after “SDWQ Alternative.”
1	<i>Executive Summary</i>	Multipl e	Multiple	Table ES-11 Table ES-12	There is an error in the spreadsheet used to calculate values in different tables, figures, and referenced in text in the <i>Executive Summary</i> , Chapter 20, Appendix L, and Master Response 8.5 related to the potential water supply effects on the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF). The number in the spreadsheet was 57.1 percent but should have been 51.7 percent. The use of 57.1 instead of 51.7 percent results in an over-estimate of the potential water supply effects on CCSF and, thus, also overestimated economic effects related to CCSF. A downward adjustment to 51.7 percent in the allocation percentage would result in lesser effects on water supply costs to CCSF, on CCSF ratepayer rates, and on local and regional economic activity, as measured in terms of economic output and number of jobs, then currently disclosed in the Final SED. For example, Appendix L, <i>City and County of San Francisco Analyses</i> , Table L.4-2, <i>Annual Average CCSF Water Bank Deficit for 6-Year Drought Period (1987-1992)</i> , currently shows the annual average water bank deficit for LSJR Alternative 3 (40 percent unimpaired flow) for Scenario 2’s increase from baseline as 119,000 acre-feet. The corrected number is 108,000 acre-feet. This error does not affect any significance determinations or conclusions in the Final SED, nor does it affect any of the information or findings disclosed in the <i>CEQA Findings or Statement of Overriding Considerations</i> that may be adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board. Thus, the error will not be corrected at this time.	
1	Chapter 16, <i>Evaluation of Other Indirect and Additional Actions</i>	16-7	16.2.1, <i>Transfer/Sale of Surface Water</i>	--		
1	Chapter 20, <i>Economic Analyses</i>	Multipl e	20.3.3, <i>Effects on Municipal and Industrial Water Supplies and Affected Regional Economies</i>	Table 20.3.3-10 Table 20.3.3-11 Table 20.3.3-12 Table 20.3.3-13 Table 20.3.3-14a Table 20.3.3-14b Table 20.3.3-15a Table 20.3.3-15b Table 20.3.3-16 Table 20.3.3-17		

Vol- ume	Chapter/ Appendix/ Master Response	Page	Section	Table/Figure	Revision	Rationale for Change
2	Appendix L, <i>City and County of San Francisco Analyses</i>	Multi- ple	L.4.2, <i>Water Bank Analysis Results</i> ; L.6.1, <i>Methodology</i> ; L.6.2, <i>Regional Economic Effects of LSJR Alternatives</i> ; L.6.3, <i>Ratepayer Effects of the LSJR Alternatives</i> ; L.6.4, <i>Sensitivity Analysis</i>	Table L.4-1 Table L.4-2 Table L.4-3 Table L.6-1a Table L.6-1b Table L.6-2 Table L.6-3 Table L.6-4 Table L.6-5 Table L.6-6 Table L.6-7 Table L.6-8 Table L.6-9 Table L.6-810 Table L.6-911		
3	Chapter 2, <i>Master Responses and Index of Form Masters (Master Response 8.5, Assessment of Potential</i>	12-19 and 43- 46	<i>SED Hydrologic Modeling</i> <i>SFPUC Hydrologic Modeling</i> <i>Key Differences in Analytical Approaches</i> <i>Economic Effects and Other Considerations</i>	Table 8.5-1 Table 8.5-2		

Vol- ume	Chapter/ Appendix/ Master Response	Page	Section	Table/Figure	Revision	Rationale for Change
	<i>Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System</i>					
2	Appendix L, <i>City and County of San Francisco Analyses</i>	L-40	L.6.4, <i>Sensitivity Analysis</i>	<p>Table L.6-8, <i>Estimated Average Annual Water Supply Effects on Economic Output during Severe Drought Periods in the Four-County Bay Area Region under LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 for Different Water Transfer Prices</i></p> <p>Table L.6-9, <i>Estimated Average Annual Water Supply Effects on Employment in the Four-County Bay Area Region during Severe Drought Periods under LSJR Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 Assuming</i></p>	<p>Table L.6-8-<u>10</u></p> <p>Table L.6-9-<u>11</u></p>	Typographical error. These two tables were numbered incorrectly and need to be numbered L.6-10 and L.6-11.

Vol- ume	Chapter/ Appendix/ Master Response	Page	Section	Table/Figure	Revision	Rationale for Change
				<i>Different Water Transfer Prices</i>		
3	Chapter 1, <i>Introductio n and Approach to Responses to Comments</i>	1-6	<i>Approach</i>	-	Steven Moore	Typographical error. Board Member Steven Moore's name was misspelled. Corrected the misspelling.
3	Chapter 2, <i>Master Responses and Index of Form Masters (Master Response 2.1, Amendment s to the Water Quality Control Plan)</i>	12	<i>Project Description</i>	--	LSJR Alternative 3, the plan amendment— evaluates 240 percent of unimpaired flow within an adaptive implementation range of 230–350 percent of unimpaired flow in the program of implementation.	Typographic error. Erroneously put the Alternative 2 description in the Alternative 3 bullet point.
3	Chapter 2, <i>Master Responses and Index of Form Masters (Master Response 8.1, Local</i>	18	<i>Deficit Irrigation in the SWAP Model</i>	Table 8.1-6	Yield reduction with reduced irrigation (Hansen <u>Hanson</u> et al. n.d.).	Typographical error. “Hanson” was misspelled as “Hansen.”

Vol- ume	Chapter/ Appendix/ Master Response	Page	Section	Table/Figure	Revision	Rationale for Change
	<i>Agricultural Economic Effects and the SWAP Model)</i>					
3	Chapter 2, Master Responses and Index of Form Masters (Master Response 8.1, <i>Local Agricultural Economic Effects and the SWAP Model)</i>	42	<i>References Cited</i>	--	Hansen, Hanson , B., D. May, T. Turini, and L. Schwankl. No date. <i>Coping with Drought: Strategies for Irrigating Processing Tomatoes</i> . University of California. Available: http://ucmanagedrought.ucdavis.edu/Agr iculture/Crop_Irrigation_Strategies/Proce ssing_Tomatoes/ . Accessed: May 31, 2018.	Typographical error. “Hanson” was misspelled as “Hansen.”
3	Chapter 4, Responses to Comments Tables	All	<i>References Cited</i>	--	Correct header to reflect the correct location in the document (Chapter 4, References) rather than Chapter 2: Master Responses and Index of Form Masters.	Typographical error.
3	Chapter 4, Responses to Comments Tables	--	<i>References Cited</i>	--	Alsop, Derek H and Chris M. Wood. 1997. The Interactive Effects of Feeding and Exercise on Oxygen Consumption, Swimming Performance and Protein Usage in Juvenile Rainbow Trout (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>). <i>The Journal of Experimental Biology</i> 200:2337–2346. Available:	Typographical error. This reference was erroneously included in Chapter 4. It is not cited in the chapter.

Vol- ume	Chapter/ Appendix/ Master Response	Page	Section	Table/Figure	Revision	Rationale for Change
					http://jeb.biologists.org/content/200/17/2337.short . Accessed: 5/30/2018	
3	Chapter 4, Responses to Comments Tables	--	References Cited	--	<u>Dahlke, et. al. 2018. <i>Managed winter flooding of alfalfa recharges groundwater with minimal crop damage</i>. January-March. Available: https://doi.org/10.3733/ca.2018a0001</u>	Typographical error. This reference was erroneously excluded.
3	Chapter 4, Responses to Comments Tables	--	References Cited	--	<u>O'Geen, A.T., et. al. 2015. <i>Soil suitability index identifies potential areas for groundwater banking on agricultural lands</i>. Available at: http://californiaagriculture.ucanr.edu/landingpage.cfm?article=ca.v069n02p75&fulltext=yes doi: 10.3733/ca.v069n02p75</u>	Typographical error. This reference was erroneously excluded.
3	Chapter 4, Responses to Comments Tables	--	References Cited	--	<u>U.C. Davis. 2018. <i>Soil Agricultural Groundwater Banking Index (SAGBI)</i>. Available at: https://casoilresource.lawr.ucdavis.edu/sagbi/</u>	Typographical error. This reference was erroneously excluded.
3	Chapter 4, Responses to Comments Tables	--	References Cited	--	<u>Buck, B.L, J. King, and V. Etyemezian. 2011. <i>Effects of Salt Mineralogy on Dust Emissions, Salton Sea, California. Soil Science Society of America Journal</i>. 75:1958–1972.</u>	Typographical error. This reference was erroneously excluded.
3	Chapter 4, Responses to Comments Tables	--	References Cited	--	<u>Coachella Valley Water District, Imperial Irrigation District, The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, and the San Diego County Water Authority. 2002. <i>Implementation of the Colorado River Quantification Settlement Agreement</i>.</u>	Typographical error. This reference was erroneously excluded.

Vol- ume	Chapter/ Appendix/ Master Response	Page	Section	Table/Figure	Revision	Rationale for Change
					<u>Volume 1 – EIR Text and Appendices. Page 3.3-1</u>	
3	Chapter 4, Responses to Comments Tables	--	<i>References Cited</i>	--	<u>Imperial Irrigation District. 2018. 1914–2004 Record of Rainfall. Available: https://web.archive.org/web/20080807131527/http://www.iid.com/Media/RRII-1-1a.pdf. Accessed: February 27, 2018).</u>	Typographical error. This reference was erroneously excluded.
3	Chapter 4, Responses to Comments Tables	--	<i>References Cited</i>	--	<u>Kelley, R. L. and R. L. Nye. 1984. Historical perspective on salinity and drainage problems in California. <i>California Agriculture</i> October 1984. Available: https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=8651.</u>	Typographical error. This reference was erroneously excluded.
3	Chapter 4, Responses to Comments Tables	--	<i>References Cited</i>	--	<u>Letey, J. 2000. Soil salinity poses challenges for sustainable agriculture and wildlife. <i>California Agriculture</i> 54 (2): 43-48. Available: http://calag.ucanr.edu/archive/?type=pdf&article=ca.v054n02p43</u>	Typographical error. This reference was erroneously excluded.
3	Chapter 4, Responses to Comments Tables	--	<i>References Cited</i>	--	<u>U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service. 1981. <i>Soil Survey of Imperial County California, Imperial Valley Area</i>. In cooperation with University of California Agricultural Experiment Station and Imperial Irrigation District. Available: https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_MANUSCRIPTS/california/CA683/0/imperial.pdf</u>	Typographical error. This reference was erroneously excluded.
3	Chapter 4, Responses to	--	<i>References Cited</i>	--	<u>U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). 2011. <i>San Joaquin-Tulare Basins National Water-Quality Assessment (NAWQA) Program—Study Unit Description</i>. Available:</u>	Typographical error. This reference was erroneously excluded.

Vol- ume	Chapter/ Appendix/ Master Response	Page	Section	Table/Figure	Revision	Rationale for Change
	<i>Comments Tables</i>				https://ca.water.usgs.gov/sanj/sanj.html . Accessed: February 27, 2018	
3	Chapter 4, Responses to Comments Tables	--	<i>References Cited</i>	--	Public Policy Institute of California. 2016. <u>Just the Facts: Water Use in California</u> . July. Available: http://www.ppic.org/publication/water-use-in-california/ .	Typographical error. This reference was erroneously excluded.
3	Chapter 4, Responses to Comments Tables	--	<i>References Cited</i>	--	City of Manteca. 2016. Final 2015 <u>Urban Water Management Plan</u> . Prepared by Kennedy/Jenks Consultants. Prepared for the City of Manteca. September.	Typographical error. This reference was erroneously excluded.
3	Chapter 4, Responses to Comments Tables	--	<i>References Cited</i>	--	City of Lathrop. 2017. <u>2015 Urban Water Management Plan for the City of Lathrop</u> . Prepared by eki environment and water. Prepared for the City of Lathrop. October.	Typographical error. This reference was erroneously excluded.
3	Chapter 4, Responses to Comments Tables	--	<i>References Cited</i>	--	City of Tracy. 2016. <u>2015 Urban Water Management Plan for the City of Tracy</u> . Prepared by eki Erler & Kalinowski, Inc. Prepared for the City of Tracy. July.	Typographical error. This reference was erroneously excluded.
3	Chapter 4, Responses to Comments Tables	--	<i>References Cited</i>	--	South San Joaquin Irrigation District. 2016. <u>Urban Water Management Plan 2015 Updated</u> . June. Prepared by Provost & Pritchard Consulting Group. Prepared for SSJID.	Typographical error. This reference was erroneously excluded.

Vol- ume	Chapter/ Appendix/ Master Response	Page	Section	Table/Figure	Revision	Rationale for Change
3	Chapter 4, <i>Responses to Comments Tables</i>	--	--	Table 4.1	Several comment numbers were incorrectly numbered for the following comment letters in Table 4-1: Letter 532, 1163, 1165, and 1176. The specific corrections to these numbers are included in Attachment 1 of this change sheet.	Typographical error.

Attachment 1

Section	Revision	Rationale for Change
Comment 532-2 and 532-3	Please see response to comment 532- 2 <u>1</u>	Typographical error. These responses were referring to the wrong number or itself and it should have referred to 532-1.
Comment 1163-19	Please see response to comment 1163- 19 <u>8</u> . The facilities and operations needed to address these impacts will be determined in the Comprehensive Operations Plan. Please see Master Response 3.3, <i>Southern Delta Water Quality</i> , for discussion of the responsibilities of DWR and USBR and the Comprehensive Operations Plan.	Typographical error. The response was referring to itself and it should have referred to 1163-18.
Comments 1165-16, 1165-19, and 1165-20.	Please see responses to comments 1165- 148 <u>17</u> and 1165- 149 <u>18</u> .	Typographical error. The response should have referred to comments 1165-17 and 1165-18. Comments 1165-148 and 1165-149 do not exist.
Comment 1165-18	Please refer to response to Comment 1165- 148 <u>17</u> .	Typographical error. The response should have referred to comment 1165-17. Comment 1165-148 does not exist.
Comments 1165-21, 1165-22, and 1165-24	Please see responses to comments 1165- 148 <u>17</u> and 1165- 149 <u>18</u> .	Typographical error. The response should have referred to comments 1165-17 and 1165-18. Comments 1165-148 and 1165-149 do not exist.
Comment 1165-23	Please see response to comment 1165- 148 <u>17</u> regarding the SED criteria for evaluating impacts to groundwater resources. See also response to comment 1165- 149 <u>18</u> .	Typographical error. The response should have referred to comments 1165-17 and 1165-18. Comments 1165-148 and 1165-149 do not exist.
Comment 1176-11	Finally, please see Master Response 8.1 regarding the scope of the agricultural economic analysis. Please see response to comment 1176- 326 <u>297</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-326 and it should have referred to response 1176-297.

Section	Revision	Rationale for Change
Comments 1176-27 through 1176-29	Please see response to comment 1176-55 <u>26</u> regarding responses related to economic considerations and the agricultural sector.	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-26.
Comment 1176-30	Please see responses to comments 1176-55 <u>26</u> and 1176-58 <u>29</u> regarding responses related to economic considerations and the agricultural sector and responses related to hydropower and economic considerations.	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-55 and 1176-58 and it should have referred to response 1176-26 and 1176-29.
Comment 1176-35	See response to Comment 1176-18 and 1176-55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.
Comment 1176-36	Please see response to comment 1176-55 <u>26</u> regarding responses related to economic considerations and the agricultural sector.	Typographical error. The response referred to 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-26.
Comment 1176-37	Please see Master Response 2.3, <i>Presentation of Data and Results in SED and Responses to Comments</i> , for a discussion of presentation of data and results. Please see response to comment 1176-55 <u>26</u> regarding responses related to economic considerations and the agricultural sector and Master Response 8.2, <i>Regional Agricultural Economic Effects</i> , for a discussion of economics analyses performed by commenters.	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-26.
Comment 1176-39	Please see response to comment 1176-55 <u>26</u> regarding responses related to economic considerations and the agricultural sector.	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-26.
Comment 1176-40	Please see response to comment 1176-55 <u>26</u> regarding responses related to economic considerations and the agricultural sector.	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-26.
Comment 1176-41	See response to Comment 1176-18 and response to comment 1176-55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.
Comment 1176-42	Please see response to comment 1176-67 <u>38</u> regarding responses related to economic considerations and the agricultural sector.	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-67 and it

Section	Revision	Rationale for Change
		should have referred to response 1176-38.
Comments 1176-43 through 1176-44	Please see response to comment 1176-55 <u>26</u> regarding responses related to economic considerations and the agricultural sector.	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-26.
Comments 1176-46 through 1176-49	Please see response to comment 1176-55 <u>26</u> regarding responses related to economic considerations and the agricultural sector and response to comment 1176-74 <u>45</u> regarding potential effects to livestock and dairies.	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-55 and 1176-74 and it should have referred to response 1176-26 and 1176-45.
Comment 1176-51	Please see response to comment 1176-205 <u>176</u> for more information regarding Woodward reservoir elevation levels.	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-205 and it should have referred to response 1176-176.
Comment 1176-53	Please see response to comment 1176-55 <u>26</u> , regarding responses related to economic considerations and the agricultural sector, and response to comment 1176-74 <u>45</u> , regarding potential effects to livestock and dairies.	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-55 and 1176-74 and it should have referred to response 1176-26 and 1176-45.
Comments 1176-54 through 1176-57	Please see response to comment 1176-55 <u>26</u> regarding responses related to economic considerations and the agricultural sector.	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-26.
Comment 1176-58	Please see response to comment 1176-80 <u>51</u> regarding recreational-related economic effects associated with reservoir elevation levels.	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-80 and it should have referred to response 1176-51.
Comment 1176-59	The commenter agrees that hydropower economic effects associated with the plan amendments are likely to be minimal. The volume of change in power generation is so small relative to California's electricity generating system that even if a more expensive replacement power source is assumed, there will be no measurable effects on ratepayers (see Section 20.3.4, <i>Effects on Hydropower Generation, Revenues and the Regional Economy</i> , and response to comment 1176-81 <u>52</u>).	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-81 and it should have referred to response 1176-52.
Comment 1176-69	Please refer to response to comment 1176-96 <u>67</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-96 and it

Section	Revision	Rationale for Change
		should have referred to response 1176-67.
Comment 1176-74	The comment provides general description of agricultural production in the three county study area. Please see response to comment 1176-55 <u>26</u> regarding responses related to economic considerations and the agricultural sector.	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-26.
Comment 1176-79	Please see response to comment 1176-55 <u>26</u> regarding responses related to economic considerations and the agricultural sector, including water supply reliability.	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-26.
Comment 1176-83	Please see response to comment 1176-55 <u>26</u> regarding responses related to economic considerations and the agricultural sector.	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-26.
Comment 1176-100	Please see response to comment 1176-18 and response to comment 1176-67 <u>38</u> regarding the approach to the groundwater analysis in the SED and economic considerations related to groundwater. Please see response to comment 1176-55 <u>26</u> regarding responses related to economic considerations and the agricultural sector, including related information about groundwater.	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18, 1176-67 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18, 1176-38 and 1176-26.
Comment 1176-105	See response to Comment 1176-18 and response to Comment 1176-55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.
Comment 1176-107	Please see response to comment 1176-55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-26.
Comment 1176-115	See response to comments 1176-18 and 1176-55 <u>26</u> . For a discussion on how the SED economic analyses was conducted, the factors considered, and differences between the SED assumptions and those made by Stratecon, please see Master Response 8.2, <i>Regional Agricultural Economic Effects</i> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.
Comment 1176-120	Please see response to Comment 1176-18 and 1176-55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.

Section	Revision	Rationale for Change
Comment 1176-123	Please see response to comments 1176-18 and 1176- 55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.
Comment 1176-126	Please see response to comments 1176-18 and 1176- 55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.
Comment 1176-129	Please see response to comments 1176-18 and 1176- 55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.
Comment 1176-132	Please see response to comment 1176-18 and 1176- 55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.
Comment 1176-135	Please see response to comments 1176-18 and 1176- 55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.
Comment 1176-138	Please see response to comments 1176-18 and 1176- 55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.
Comment 1176-141	Please see response to comments 1176-18, 1176- 55 <u>26</u> and 1176- 67 <u>38</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18, 1176-55 and 1176-67 and it should have referred to response 1176-18, 1176-26 and 1176-38.
Comment 1176-143	Please refer to response to comments 1176-18, 1176- 55 <u>26</u> , and 1176- 67 <u>38</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18, 1176-55 and 1176-67 and it should have referred to response 1176-18, 1176-26 and 1176-38.

Section	Revision	Rationale for Change
Comment 1176-144	Please see response to comments 1176-18 and 1176- 55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.
Comment 1176-149	Please see response to comments 1176-18 and 1176- 55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.
Comment 1176-152	Please see response to comment 1176-82 53 regarding dairies, IMPLAN, and livestock. Please see Master Response 8.2, <i>Regional Agricultural Economic Effects</i> , for discussion of the potential economic effects on dairies and food processors.	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-82 and it should have referred to response 1176-53.
Comment 1176-157	Please see response to comments 1176-18 and 1176- 55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.
Comment 1176-161	Please see response to comment 1176-18 and 1176- 55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.
Comment 1176-167	See response to comments 1176-18, 1176- 55 <u>26</u> , and 1176- 195 <u>166</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18, 1176-55 and 1176-195 and it should have referred to response 1176-18, 1176-26 and 1176-166.
Comment 1176-177	The reduced power production volume is small (see Section 20.3.4, <i>Effects on Hydropower Generation, Revenues and the Regional Economy</i> , and response to comment 1176- 81 <u>52</u>), as the commenter acknowledged, and the difference may be replaced by other energy sources, or by conservation (reduced demand) or both. Regardless, the effects on consumers will be minimal.	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-81 and it should have referred to response 1176-52.
Comment 1176-178	See response to comments 1176-18 and 1176- 55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.

Section	Revision	Rationale for Change
Comment 1176-179	See response to comments 1176-18 and 1176- 55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.
Comment 1176-188	Please see response to comments 1176-18 and 1176- 55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.
Comment 1176-197	Please see response to comments 1176-18 and 1176- 55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.
Comment 1176-205	Please see responses to comments 1176- 55 <u>26</u> , 1176- 74 <u>45</u> , and 1176- 82 <u>53</u> regarding agricultural economic considerations, dairies and livestock, and IMPLAN.	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-55, 1176-74 and 1176-82 and it should have referred to response 1176-26, 1176-45 and 1176-53.
Comment 1176-213	Please see response to comments 1176- 55 <u>26</u> , and 1176- 67 <u>38</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-55 and 1176-67 and it should have referred to response 1176-26 and 1176-38.
Comment 1176-217	Please see response to comment 1176- 495 <u>166</u> and 1176- 242 <u>213</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-195 and 1176-242 and it should have referred to response 1176-166 and 1176-213.
Comment 1176-221	Please see response to comments 1176-18, 1176- 55 <u>26</u> , 1176- 495 <u>166</u> , 1176- 238 <u>209</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18, 1176-55, 1176-195 and 1176-238 and it should have referred to response 1176-18, 1176-26, 1176-166 and 1176-209.
Comment 1176-225	Please see response to comment 1176- 55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-26.

Section	Revision	Rationale for Change
Comment 1176-236	Please see the response to comments 1176-18 and 1176- 55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.
Comment 1176-238	Please see response to comment 1176- 55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-26.
Comments 1176-240, 1176-242, 1176-246, 1176-250, 1176-254, 1176-258, 1176-262, 1176-265, 1176-268, 1176-271, 1176-274, 1176-277, and 1176-280	Please see response to comments 1176-18 and 1176- 55 <u>26</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-18 and 1176-55 and it should have referred to response 1176-18 and 1176-26.
Comment 1176-291	Please see response to comment 1176- 326 <u>297</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-326 and it should have referred to response 1176-297.
Comments 1176-306, 1176-307, 1176-308, 1176-310, 1176-311, 1176-313, and 1176-314	Please see response to Comment 1176- 334 <u>305</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to responses 1176-334 and it should have referred to response 1176-305.
Comment 1176-309	Please see response to Comment 1176- 337 <u>308</u> .	Typographical error. The response referred to response 1176-337 and it should have referred to response 1176-308.